Laura Salerno Owens, OSB #076230 LauraSalerno@MarkowitzHerbold.com David B. Markowitz, OSB #742046 DavidMarkowitz@MarkowitzHerbold.com Harry B. Wilson, OSB #077214 HarryWilson@MarkowitzHerbold.com Kathryn P. Roberts, OSB #064854 KathrynRoberts@MarkowitzHerbold.com MARKOWITZ HERBOLD PC 1455 SW Broadway, Suite 1900

Portland, OR 97201

Telephone: (503) 295-3085

Laura L. Ho (admitted *pro hac vice*)

lho@gbdhlegal.com

Barry Goldstein, Of Counsel (admitted *pro hac vice*)

bgoldstein@gbdhlegal.com

James Kan (admitted pro hac vice)

jkan@gbdhlegal.com

Byron Goldstein (admitted *pro hac vice*)

brgoldstein@gbdhlegal.com

Katharine L. Fisher (admitted *pro hac vice*)

kfisher@gbdhlegal.com

GOLDSTEIN, BORGEN, DARDARIAN & HO

155 Grand Avenue, Suite 900

Oakland, CA 94612

Telephone: (510) 763-9800 | Fax: (510) 835-1417

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Additional counsel of record listed on signature page

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF OREGON PORTLAND DIVISION

KELLY CAHILL, et al., individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Case No. 3:18-cv-01477-AB

PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED VERDICT **FORM**

Plaintiffs,

v.

NIKE, INC., an Oregon Corporation,

Defendant.

Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court use the attached Verdict Form.

DATED: January 27, 2025 GOLDSTEIN, BORGEN, DARDARIAN & HO

s/Laura Salerno Owens

Barry Goldstein, Of Counsel (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Laura L. Ho (admitted *pro hac vice*)
James Kan (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Byron Goldstein (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Katharine L. Fisher (admitted *pro hac vice*)

MARKOWITZ HERBOLD PC

Laura Salerno Owens, OSB #076230 LauraSalerno@MarkowitzHerbold.com David B. Markowitz, OSB #742046 DavidMarkowitz@MarkowitzHerbold.com Harry B. Wilson, OSB #077214 HarryWilson@MarkowitzHerbold.com Kathryn P. Roberts, OSB #064854 KathrynRoberts@MarkowitzHerbold.com

INDIA LIN BODIEN LAW

India Lin Bodien (admitted *pro hac vice*) india@indialinbodienlaw.com 2522 North Proctor Street, #387 Tacoma, WA 98406-5338 Tel: (253) 503-1672

Fax: (253) 276-0081

ACKERMANN & TILAJEF, P.C.

Craig J. Ackermann (admitted *pro hac vice*) cja@ackermanntilajef.com
Erika Smolyar (admitted *pro hac vice*)
es@ackermanntilajef.com
315 South Beverly Drive, Suite 504
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 277-0614

Tel: (310) 277-0614 Fax: (310) 277-0635

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

2256758

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF OREGON PORTLAND DIVISION

KELLY CAHILL, et al., individually and Case No. 3:18-cv-01477-AB on behalf of others similarly situated, **VERDICT FORM** Plaintiffs, v. NIKE, INC., an Oregon Corporation, Defendant. We, the jury being duly impaneled and sworn, provide the following answers to the questions submitted by the Court: I. **Federal Equal Pay Act** QUESTION 1: Have plaintiffs proven that Nike, Inc. violated the Federal Equal Pay Act by a preponderance of the evidence? _____ Yes _____ No Kelly Cahill Lindsay Elizabeth ____ Yes ____ No Heather Hender _____ Yes _____ No If you answered "Yes" to any of Question 1 then proceed to Question 1A. If you answered "No" to all of Question 1, then proceed to Question 3.

	QUESTION 1A: Did	d plaintiffs prove that	Nike's violation of the Federal Equal Pay Act				
was wi	illful?						
	Kelly Cahill	Yes	_ No				
	Lindsay Elizabeth	Yes	_ No				
	Heather Hender	Yes	_ No				
	QUESTION 2: If yo	u find that defendant l	Nike, Inc.'s violation of the Equal Pay Act was				
willful	, what are plaintiffs' d	amages, if any, result	ing from its willful violation?				
	Kelly Cahill	\$					
	Lindsay Elizabeth	\$					
	Heather Hender	\$					
	QUESTION 2A: If	you find that defendar	nt Nike, Inc.'s violation of the Equal Pay Act				
was no	t willful, what are pla	intiffs' damages, if an	y, resulting from its violation?				
	Kelly Cahill	\$					
	Lindsay Elizabeth	\$					
	Heather Hender	\$					
II. Oregon Equal Pay Act							
	QUESTION 3: Have plaintiffs proven that defendant Nike, Inc. violated the Oregon						
Equal 1	Pay Act by a preponde	erance of the evidence	?				
	Kelly Cahill	Yes	_ No				
	Lindsay Elizabeth	Yes	_ No				
	Heather Hender	Yes	_ No				
	If you answered "Yes	" to any of Question .	3 then proceed to Question 4. If you answered				
"No" 1	to all of Question 3, th	en proceed to Questic	on 5.				

QUESTION 4: Wha	QUESTION 4: What are plaintiffs' damages, if any, against defendant Nike, Inc.				
resulting from the violation of the Oregon Equal Pay Act?					
Kelly Cahill	\$				
Lindsay Elizabeth	\$				
Heather Hender	\$				
QUESTION 4A: Wh	nat amount of punitive damages, if any, should be awarded against				
defendant Nike, Inc. resulting from the violation of the Oregon Equal Pay Act?					
Kelly Cahill	\$				
Lindsay Elizabeth	\$				
Heather Hender	\$				
III. Disparate Treatment					
a. Disparate Treatment in Pay (Federal and State Claims)					
QUESTION 5: Have	QUESTION 5: Have plaintiffs proven their claim of Disparate Treatment in pay by a				
preponderance of the evidence?					
Kelly Cahill	Yes No				
Lindsay Elizabeth	Yes No				
Heather Hender	Yes No				
If you answered "Yes	s" to any of Question 5 then proceed to Question 6. If you answered				
"No" to all of Question 5, then proceed to Question 7.					

i. Economic Damages for Disparate Treatment in Pay (Federal and **State Claims**)

QUESTION 6: What are plaintiffs' damages, if any, against defendant Nike, Inc.						
resulting from its disparate treatment in pay?						
Kelly Cahill	\$					
Lindsay Elizabeth	\$					
Heather Hender	\$					
ii. Punitive Damages for Disparate Treatment in Pay (Federal and State						
Claims)						
QUESTION 6A: Wh	QUESTION 6A: What amount of punitive damages, if any, should be awarded against					
defendant Nike, Inc. resulting from the disparate treatment in pay violation of the Federal Civil						
Rights Act of 1964?						
Lindsay Elizabeth	\$					
Heather Hender	\$					
QUESTION 6B: What amount of punitive damages, if any, should be awarded against						
defendant Nike, Inc. resulting from the disparate treatment in pay violation of the Oregon						
Equality Act?						
Kelly Cahill	\$					
Lindsay Elizabeth	\$					
Heather Hender	\$					

b. Disparate Treatment in Promotion (Federal and State)

QUESTION /: Have plaintiffs proven their claim of Disparate Treatment in promotion						
by a preponderance of the evidence?						
Kelly Cahill Yes No						
Heather Hender Yes No						
Sara Johnston Yes No						
If you answered "Yes" to any of Question 7 then	n proceed to Question 8. If you answered					
"No" to all of Question 7, then proceed to Question 9.						
i. Economic Damages for Disparate Treatment in Promotion (Federal						
and State Claims)						
QUESTION 8: What are plaintiffs' damages, if	QUESTION 8: What are plaintiffs' damages, if any, against defendant Nike, Inc.					
resulting from the disparate treatment in promotion violation?						
Kelly Cahill \$						
Heather Hender \$						
Sara Johnston \$						
ii. Punitive Damages for Disparate Treatment in Promotion (Federal						
and State Claims)						
QUESTION 8A: What amount of punitive damages, if any, should be awarded against						
defendant Nike, Inc. resulting from the disparate treatment in promotion violation of the Federal						
Civil Rights Act of 1964?						
Heather Hender \$						
Sara Johnston \$						

The presiding juror should	ld sign and date the verdict form. By signing this form, the
presiding juror confirms that the	responses to each question were unanimous.
DATED:	, 2025
	Presiding Juror
	Juror No
	Signed on behalf of the jury,
	Amy M. Baggio
	United States District Judge